arXiv:math/9911152v1 [math.RA] 19 Nov 1999

INDEX OF HADAMARD MULTIPLICATION BY POSITIVE MATRICES II

GUSTAVO CORACH * AND DEMETRIO STOJANOFF †

Gustavo Corach.
Instituto Argentino de Matemática,
Saavedra 15 Piso 3 (1083), Buenos Aires Argentina
e-mail: gcorach@mate.dm.uba.ar

Demetrio Stojanoff
Depto. de Matemática,
UNLP, 1 y 50 (1900), La Plata, Argentina
e-mail: demetrio@mate.dm.uba.ar

Abstract. Given a definite nonnegative matrix $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$, we study the minimal index of A : $I(A) = \max\{\lambda \geq 0 : A \circ B \geq \lambda B$ for all $0 \leq B\}$, where $A \circ B$ denotes the Hadamard product $(A \circ B)_{ij} = A_{ij}B_{ij}$. For any unitary invariant norm N in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, we consider the N-index of A: $I(N, A) = \min\{N(A \circ B) : B \geq 0$ and $N(B) = 1\}$ If A has nonnegative entries, then $I(A) = I(\|\cdot\|_{sp}, A)$ if and only if there exists a vector u with nonnegative entries such that $Au = (1, \dots, 1)^T$. We also show that $I(\|\cdot\|_2, A) = I(\|\cdot\|_{sp}, \bar{A} \circ A)^{1/2}$. We give formulae for $I(N, A)$, for an arbitrary unitary invariant norm N, when A is a diagonal matrix or a rank 1 matrix. As an application we find, for a bounded invertible selfadjoint operator S on a Hilbert space, the best constant $M(S)$ such that $\|STS + S^{-1}TS^{-1}\| \geq M(S)\|T\|$ for all $0 \leq T$.

Key words. Hadamard product, definite nonnegative matrices, norm inequalities

AMS subject classifications. Primary 47A30, 47B15

---

[*] Supported UBACYT TX79, PIP 4463 (CONICET), Fundación Antorchas and ANPCYT PICT 97-2259 (Argentina)

[†] Supported UBACYT TW49, PIP 4463 (CONICET) and ANPCYT PICT 97-2259 (Argentina)

1. Introduction. We denote by $M_n = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ the C^*-algebra of $n \times n$ matrices over $\mathbb{C}$ and by $P(n) \subset M_n = \{A \in M_n : A \geq 0\}$ the set of definite nonnegative matrices. Given $A, B \in M_n$, we denote by $A \circ B$ their Hadamard product, i.e. the matrix with entries $(A \circ B)_{i,j} = A_{ij} B_{ij}$.

For $A \in M_n$ we consider the map $\Phi_A : M_n \to M_n$ given by $\Phi_A(B) = A \circ B$, for $B \in M_n$. By Schur Theorem [19], $A \circ B \in P(n)$ if $A, B \in P(n)$. Thus, as a map between $*$-algebras, Φ_A is positive (actually it is completely positive, [18] Prop. 1.2). Haagerup [12] has described the norm of Φ_A for $A \in M_n$ in terms of the factorizations $A = B^*C$. Other papers (see for example [1], [3], [8], [9], [10], [14], [17], [18] and references included therein) contain characterizations of several norms of Φ_A. In the second author's paper [20] the following problem was posed and partially solved: given $A \in P(n)$, calculate the infimum of $\|\Phi_A(B)\|$, for $B \in P(n)$ with norm one. This problem has two origins: on one side it comes from the study of the index theory of completely positive maps on operator algebras (see [6] and [11]). On the other side, it was motivated by the search of optimal bounds for certain operator inequalities (see [7] and [4]).

This paper is the natural continuation of [20] in both directions. We show several new characterizations of the two indexes defined in [20] and study the natural generalization of the index of a positive matrix in terms of any unitary invariant norm in M_n. We also get, for a bounded selfadjoint invertible operator S on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, the best constant $M(S)$ such that

$$\|STS + S^{-1}TS^{-1}\| \geq M(S)\|T\|$$

for all positive operator T on $\mathcal{H}$. Let us give more explicit definitions of those Hadamard indexes:

Definition 1.1. The Hadamard **minimal** index of $A \in P(n)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} I(A) &= \max \{ \lambda \geq 0 \ : \ A \circ B \geq \lambda B \quad \forall\ B \in P(n) \} \\ &= \max \{ \lambda \geq 0 \ : \ \Phi_A - \lambda\ Id \geq 0 \quad \text{on} \quad P(n) \} \\ &= \max \{ \lambda \geq 0 \ : \ A - \lambda P \geq 0 \} \end{aligned}$$

where $P \in P(n)$ is the matrix with all its entries equal to 1. The last equality follows from the fact that for $C \in M_n$, $\Phi_C \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow C \geq 0$ (see [9]). In [20] it is used the notation II_A instead of $I(A)$.

Definition 1.2. For a unitary invariant norm N in M_n, the Hadamard N-index for $A \in P(n)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} I(N, A) &= \max \{ \lambda \geq 0 \ : \ N(A \circ B) \geq \lambda N(B) \quad \forall B \in P(n) \} \\ &= \min \{ N(A \circ B) \ : \ B \in P(n) \ \text{ and } \ N(B) = 1 \} \\ &= \min \{ N(B)^{-1} \ : \ 0 \neq B \in P(n) \ \text{ and } \ N(A \circ B) \leq 1 \}. \end{aligned}$$

For the Schatten p-norms, $1 \le p < \infty$, we shall write $I(p, A)$ instead of $I(\|\cdot\|_p, A)$. Note that the Schatten norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is the spectral norm $\|\cdot\|_{sp}$. The associated index will be denoted by $I(sp, \cdot)$. In [20] it is used the notation I_A instead of $I(sp, A)$.

EXAMPLE 1.3. Let $A, B \in P(n)$. Then

$$\|B\|_1 = tr(B) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} B_{ii} \quad \text{and} \quad \|A \circ B\|_1 = tr(A \circ B) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ii} B_{ii}.$$

¿From these identities it is easy to see that, for every $A \in P(n)$,

$$I(1, A) = \min_{1 \le i \le n} A_{ii}.$$

We summarize the principal results of this work in the following theorems:

THEOREM 1.4. *Let $A \in P(n)$. Then*

1. *$I(A) \neq 0$ if and only if the vector $p = (1, \ldots, 1)^*$ belongs to the range of A. In this case, for any vector y such that $Ay = p$, it holds*

$$I(A) = \langle Ay, y\rangle^{-1} = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i)^{-1} = \min \{ \langle Az, z\rangle \; : \; \sum_{i=1}^{n} z_i = 1 \}.$$

   (see 2.2 and 2.5).
2. *Let $B \in P(m)$. Then $I(A \otimes B) = I(A)\ I(B)$ (see 2.3).*
3. *If A has nonnegative entries and $I(sp, A) \neq 0$, then*

$$I(sp, A) = I(A)$$

   if and only if there exist a vector u with **nonnegative entries** *such that $A(u) = p = (1, \ldots, 1)^*$ (see Theorem 2.8).*

THEOREM 1.5. *Let $A \in P(n)$. Then*

1. *$I(2, A) = I(sp, \bar{A} \circ A)^{1/2}$ (see Theorem 3.3).*
2. *If A has nonnegative entries, then (see 3.6)*

$$I(sp, A) = \min\{I(sp, A_J) : J \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\} \quad \textit{and} \quad I(sp, A_J) = I(A_J)\}.$$

THEOREM 1.6. *Let $A \in P(n)$ and N an unitary invariant norm in M_n. Then*

1. *$I(N, A) = 0 \Leftrightarrow A_{ii} = 0$ for some $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.*
2. *If A has rank one, then $I(N, A) = \min_{1 \le i \le n} A_{ii}$ (see 5.2).*
3. *If A is diagonal and invertible, then $I(N, A) = N'(A^{-1})^{-1}$, where N' is the dual norm of N (see 5.3).*

THEOREM 1.7. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space and S a bounded selfadjoint invertible operator on $\mathcal{H}$. Let $M(S)$ be the best constant such that*

$$\|STS + S^{-1}TS^{-1}\| \ge M(S)\|T\| \quad \textit{for all} \;\; 0 \le T \in L(\mathcal{H}).$$

Then $M(S) = \min\{M_1(S), M_2(S)\}$, *where*

$$M_1(S) = \min_{\lambda\in\ \sigma(S)} \lambda^2 + \lambda^{-2} \qquad \textit{and}$$

$$M_2(S) = \inf\Big\{ \frac{(|\lambda|+|\mu|)^2}{1+\lambda^2\mu^2} : \lambda,\mu\in\sigma(S), |\lambda|<|\mu| \ \textit{and}\ \lambda^2 \le \frac{1}{|\lambda\mu|} \le \mu^2 \Big\}.$$

In particular, if $\|S\|\le 1$ *(resp.* $\|S^{-1}\|\le 1$*), then*

$$M(S) = \|S\|^2 + \|S\|^{-2} \quad (\textit{resp.} \quad \|S^{-1}\|^2 + \|S^{-1}\|^{-2}).$$

2. The minimal index $I(A)$.

Recall from Definition 1.1 that for $A\in P(n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} I(A) &= \max\ \{\ \lambda\ge 0\ :\ A\circ B \ge \lambda B \quad \forall\ B\in P(n)\ \} \\ &= \max\ \{\ \lambda \ge 0\ :\ A-\lambda P\ge 0\ \} \end{aligned}$$

where $P\in P(n)$ is the matrix with all its entries equal to 1.

Remark 2.1. Let $A\in P(n)$.

1. The index $I(\cdot)$ is caalled minimal because for every unitary invariant norm N, it holds that $I(A)\le I(N,A)$. Indeed, given $B\in P(n)$, then $A\circ B\ge I(A)B$ and, by Weyl theorem, $I(A)s_i(B)\le s_i(A\circ B)$, $1\le i\le n$ (s_i denote the singular values). Therefore $I(A)N(B)\le N(A\circ B)$.
2. If A is invertible, then (see Theorem 4.5 of [20]) $\det(A+P)>\det(A)$ and

$$I(A) = \frac{\det(A)}{\det(A+P)-\det(A)} = (\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}(A^{-1})_{ij})^{-1} =\ \langle p, A^{-1}p\rangle^{-1},$$

   where $p=(1,\dots,1)^*$ and $P=pp^*$.
3. If a sequence $(A_m)_{m\in\mathrm{IN}}$ in $P(n)$ decreases to A, then (see Remark 4.3 of [20])

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} I(A_m) = \inf_{m\in\mathrm{IN}} I(A_m) = I(A).$$

4. If $J\subseteq\{1,\ 2,\dots,\ n\}$ and A_J is the principal submatrix of A associated to J, then $I(A)\le I(A_J)$. Also $I(N,A)\le I(N,A_J)$ for every unitary invariant norm N. Indeed, these inequalities can be deduced easily from the definitions of the index.

By the Remark above, if $A\in P(n)$ is invertible and $y=A^{-1}p$, then

$$0\ne I(A) =\ \langle p, A^{-1}p\rangle^{-1}\ =\ \langle Ay, y\rangle^{-1}.$$

In the next Proposition we shall see that the same formula also holds for non invertible $A \in P(n)$, under the hypothesis that p belongs to the range of A.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Let $A \in P(n)$. Then $I(A) \neq 0$ if and only if the vector $p = (1, \ldots, 1)^*$ belongs to the range of A. In this case, for any vector y such that $A(y) = p$, we have that*

$$I(A) = \langle Ay, y\rangle^{-1} = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i)^{-1} \ .$$

Proof. First note that if p lies in the range of A then $p \in \ker A^{\perp}$. This means that $\langle Aw, w\rangle = \langle Ay, y\rangle$ for every pair w, y such that $Aw = Ay = p$.

Let Q the orthogonal projection onto $\ker A$. Then the sequence $A_m = A + \frac{1}{m}Q$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, decreases to A and $I(A) = \lim_{m\to\infty} I(A_m)$. Note that A_m is invertible for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

If there exists a vector y with $Ay = p$, let $y = w+z$ with $z \in \ker A$ and $w \in \ker A^{\perp}$. Note that $A_m^{-1}\ p = w,\ \forall\ m$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} I(A) &= \lim_{m\to\infty} I(A_m) \\ &= \lim_{m\to\infty} \langle p, A_m^{-1} p\rangle^{-1} \\ &= \langle p, w\rangle^{-1} \ = \ \langle p, y\rangle^{-1} \\ &= \langle Ay, y\rangle^{-1} \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $p \notin ImA$, let

$$p = y + z\ , \quad y \in ImA \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \neq z \in \ker A.$$

If $Ax = y$ with $x \in \ker A^{\perp}$, then $A_m^{-1}p = x + mz$. Therefore

$$I(A_m)^{-1} = \langle p, A_m^{-1}p\rangle \ = \ \langle p, x\rangle + m\langle p, z\rangle \ = \ \langle p, x\rangle + m\|z\|^2 \to \infty.$$

Then $I(A) = 0$ ▮

COROLLARY 2.3. *Let $A \in P(n)$ and $B \in P(m)$. Consider the Kronecker product matrix*

$$A \otimes B = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11}B & \ldots & A_{1n}B \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ A_{n1}B & \ldots & A_{nn}B \end{pmatrix} \in P(nm).$$

Then

$$I(A \otimes B) = I(A)\ I(B).$$

Proof. Suppose that $I(A) \neq 0 \neq I(B)$. For any $k \in \mathrm{I\!N}$ denote by $p_k \in \mathbb{C}^k$ the vector with all its entries equal to 1. Let $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $y \in \mathbb{C}^m$ such that $Ax = p_n$ and $By = p_m$. Then $z = (x_i y, x_2 y, \dots, x_n y)^t \in \mathbb{C}^{nm}$ verifies that $(A \otimes B)z = p_{nm}$. Also

$$\begin{aligned} I(A \otimes B)^{-1} &= \langle z, p_{nm} \rangle \\ &= \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i \sum_{j=1}^{m} y_j) \\ &= \langle x, p_n \rangle \ \langle y, p_m \rangle \ = I(A)^{-1} \ I(B)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

If $I(A) = 0$ or $I(B) = 0$ then $I(A \otimes B) = 0$: this can be verified by just multiplying by appropiate matrices of the type $C \otimes D$, since $(A \otimes B) \circ (C \otimes D) = (A \circ C) \otimes (B \circ D)$ ▮

REMARK 2.4. As a particular case of Corollary 2.3, the inflation matrix $A^{(m)} = p_m p_m^* \otimes A$ verifies $I(A^{(m)}) = I(A)$ for all $A \in P(n)$ and $m \in \mathrm{I\!N}$. Using proposition (3.9) of [20], it can be also shown that

$$I(sp, A^{(m)}) = I(sp, A) \tag{1}$$

for all $A \in P(n)$ and $m \in \mathrm{I\!N}$. Indeed, if $A = BB^*$, then

$$I(sp, A) = \min_{\|x\|=1} \|D_x B\|^2,$$

where D_x denotes the diagonal matrix with the vector x in its diagonal. Using also this formula for $A^{(m)}$ and the fact that

$$A^{(m)} = \begin{pmatrix} B & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ B & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ B & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B^* & B^* & \dots & B^* \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

one easily gets the equality (1).

COROLLARY 2.5. *Let $A \in P(n)$. Then*

$$I(A) = \min \ \{ \ \langle Az, z \rangle \ : \ \sum_{i=1}^{n} z_i = 1 \ \}$$

Proof. Given a vector z such that $\langle z, p \rangle \ = 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Az, z \rangle \ = \ \textstyle\sum_{ij} A_{ij} z_j \bar{z}_i \ &= \ \langle (A \circ \bar{z}\bar{z}^*) p, p \rangle \\ &\geq \ I(A) \langle \bar{z}\bar{z}^* p, p \rangle \ = \ I(A) \textstyle\sum_{ij} \bar{z}_i \bar{z}_j \\ &= \ I(A) \ \langle p, z \rangle^2 \ = I(A) \end{aligned}$$

If there exists $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $Ax = p$, the vector $z = I(A)x$ verifies

$$\langle p, z\rangle = I(A)\ \langle p, x\rangle = 1 \quad \text{and}$$

$$\langle Az, z\rangle = I(A)\langle p, z\rangle = I(A)$$

by Proposition 2.2. But if $p \notin (\ker A)^\perp$, then there exists $z \in \ker A$ such that $\langle z, p\rangle = 1$ and $\langle Az, z\rangle = 0 = I(A)$ ∎

The following result seems to be very well known. We shall state it with a proof for the sake of completeness and because we shall use it in a precise formulation (in Theorem 2.8 and Proposition 3.2).

LEMMA 2.6. *Let* $B \in P(n) \cap M_n(\mathbb{R})$ *and* $M = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_i z_i = 1\}$. *Then*

$$V_1 = \{z \in M : \langle Bz, z\rangle = I(B)\} = \{z \in M : Bz = I(B)p\} = V_2 \neq \emptyset,$$

where $p = (1, \dots, 1)^*$. *Moreover, any local extreme point of the map* $G(z) = \langle Bz, z\rangle$ *restricted to* M *belongs to* V_2.

Proof. It is clear that $V_2 \subseteq V_1$. Recall from the proof of Corollary 2.5 (and the fact that $B \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$) that $V_2 \neq \emptyset$, so $I(B) = \min\{\ \langle Av, v\rangle \ : \ v \in M\ \}$. The map $G(z) = \langle Bz, z\rangle = \sum_{i,j} b_{ij} z_j z_i$ is differentiable. So we can use Lagrange multipliers in order to find its critical points in M. Let $F(z, \lambda) = \sum_{i,j} b_{ij} z_j z_i - 2\lambda(\sum_1^n z_i - 1)$. Then, since $B^t = B$,

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial z_i}(z, \lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij} z_j + \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ji} z_j - 2\lambda = 2\sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij} z_j - 2\lambda = 2((Bz)_i - \lambda).$$

So, if $z \in M$, $\frac{\partial F}{\partial z_i}(z, \lambda) = 0$ for all i if and only if $Bz = \lambda p$. But, in that case,

$$I(B) \leq \langle Bz, z\rangle = \lambda\langle p, z\rangle = \lambda.$$

If $I(B) = 0$ then $\lambda = 0$, since $p \notin \text{Im } B$, by Proposition 2.2. If $I(B) > 0$ then also $\lambda = I(B)$, since $y = \lambda^{-1} z$ verifies $By = p$ and

$$\lambda = \langle Bz, z\rangle = \lambda^2 \langle By, y\rangle = \lambda^2 I(B)^{-1}.$$

So $z \in M$ is a critical point if and only if $z \in V_2$. Since each local extreme mast be a critical point, this shows that $V_1 \subseteq V_2$ and the final assertion. ∎

The following Lemma, which is rather elementary, is useful in order to identify vectors x such that some index is attained at the matrix xx^*.

LEMMA 2.7. *Let* $A \in M_n$ *and* $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ *with* $\|x\| = 1$. *Let* $y = x \circ \bar{x} = (|x_1|^2, \dots, |x_n|^2)^*$. *Denote by* $p = (1, \dots, 1)^*$. *Then*

1. *If* $Ay = \lambda p$, *with* $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, *then* x *is an eigenvector of the matrix* $A \circ xx^*$.
2. *If all* $x_i \neq 0$ *and* $(A \circ xx^*)x = \lambda x$ *for some* $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, *then* $Ay = \lambda p$.

If $A \in P(n)$, the eigenvalue λ associated to x must be $I(A)$ and $Ay = I(A)\ p$. *Proof.* Suppose that $Ay = \lambda p$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(A \circ xx^*)x &= (a_{ij}x_i\bar{x}_j)\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (\sum_j a_{1j}|x_j|^2)\ x_1 \\ \vdots \\ (\sum_j a_{nj}|x_j|^2)\ x_n \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (Ay)_1\ x_1 \\ \vdots \\ (Ay)_n\ x_n \end{pmatrix} = \lambda\ x.\end{aligned}$$

The same equation shows that if x is an eigenvector of $A \circ xx^*$ with non zero entries, then $Ay = \lambda p$, where λ is the eigenvalue of x. If $A \in P(n)$ and $I(A) = 0$, then $\lambda = 0$ since $p \notin \text{Im}A$. If $I(A) \neq 0$, then $p \in \text{Im } A = (\ker A)^\perp$. So $Ay \neq 0$ since $1 = \|x\|^2 = \langle p, y\rangle \neq 0$. Then $\lambda \neq 0$. If $z = \lambda^{-1}y$, then $Az = p$ and

$$1 = \langle p, y\rangle = \lambda\ \langle Az, z\rangle = \lambda\ I(A)^{-1},$$

by Proposition 2.2. So $\lambda = I(A)$ ∎

Concerning the problem of characterize those matrices $A \in P(n)$ such that $I(A) = I(sp, A)$, in [20] it is shown that for $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ \bar{b} & c \end{pmatrix} \in P(2)$, then

$$0 \neq I(sp, A) = I(A) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad b \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } 0 \leq b \leq \min\{a, c\} \neq 0. \tag{2}$$

This is easily seen to be equivalent to the conditions

1. A has nonnegative entries.
2. There exists a vector z with nonnegative entries such that $Az = (1, 1)^*$ (if A is invertible, this means that $A^{-1}(1, 1)^*$ has nonnegative entries). .

In the next Theorem we prove that, for matrices of any size with nonnegative entries, condition 2 is equivalent to the identity $I(sp, A) = I(A)$.

THEOREM 2.8. *Let $A \in P(n)$ with nonnegative entries such that all $A_{ii} \neq 0$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *There exist a vector u with* **nonnegative entries** *such that $Au = p = (1, \dots, 1)^*$.*
2. *$I(sp, A) = I(A)$.*

In that case, if $y = I(A)\ u$, then

(a) *Let $x = (y_1^{1/2}, \dots, y_n^{1/2})^t$. Then $\|x\| = 1$ and*

$$\|A \circ xx^*\| = I(sp, A)$$

(b) *Let $J = \{i : u_i \neq 0\}$ and denote by A_J the principal submatrix of A determined by J. Then $I(A) = I(A_J) = I(sp, A_J) = I(sp, A)$.*

Proof. **2** $\to$ **1** Suppose $I(A) = I(sp, A)$. Note that $I(sp, A) \neq 0$ by Corollary 3.4 of [20] (or Remark 5.1). Let $M = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_i z_i = 1\}$. By Lemma 2.1 of [20], there exists $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $\|x\| = 1$ and $I(sp, A) = \|A \circ xx^*\|$. Denote $y = (|x_1|^2, \dots, |x_n|^2)^* \in M$. Then, by Corollary 2.5,

$$\begin{aligned} I(A) = I(sp, A) &\geq \langle (A \circ xx^*)x, x\rangle \\ &= \textstyle\sum_{ij} A_{ij}|x_i|^2|x_j|^2 \\ &= \langle Ay, y\rangle \geq I(A). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.6, $Ay = I(A)p$ and y has nonnegative entries. Take $u = I(A)^{-1}y$.
1 $\to$ **2** Let u a vector with nonnegative entries such that $Au = p$. Let $y = I(A)u \in M$ and x as in item (a). Clearly $\|x\| = 1$. By Lemma 2.7 we know that x is an eigenvector of $A \circ xx^*$ with eigenvalue $I(A)$. Recall that always $I(A) \leq I(sp, A)$.
Case 1. Suppose that x has strictly positive entries. Since $A \circ xx^*$ has nonnegative entries, it is well known (see Corollary 8.1.30 of [13]) that the eigenvalue $I(A)$ of x must be the spectral radius of $A \circ xx^*$. Since $A \circ xx^* \in P(n)$ we deduce that $I(A) = \|A \circ xx^*\| \geq I(sp, A)$.
Case 2. Let $J = \{i : x_i \neq 0\}$, A_J the principal submatrix of A determined by the indexes of J and similarly define x_J. Then x_J is an eigenvector of $A_J \circ x_J x_J^*$ with eigenvalue $I(A)$. Note also that $A_J \circ x_J x_J^* \geq I(A_J) x_J x_J^*$ and $x_J x_J^*(x_J) = \|x_J\|^2 x_J = x_J$. Then

$$0 \leq \langle (A_J \circ x_J x_J^* - I(A_J) x_J x_J^*) x_J, x_J\rangle = I(A) - I(A_J)$$

and, by Remark 2.1, $I(A_J) = I(A)$. Now, as in case 1, we can deduce that

$$I(A) = I(A_J) = \|A_J \circ x_J x_J^*\| \geq I(sp, A_J) \geq I(sp, A),$$

where the last inequality holds by Remark 2.1. Clearly $I(sp, A)$ is attained at xx^* ∎

Remark 2.9. In the last Theorem, the hypothesis that all $A_{ij} \geq 0$ is essential in the implication 1 $\to$ 2. Indeed, consider $A = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $u = (2, 3)^*$. Then $Au = (1, 1)^*$ but $1/5 = I(A) \neq I(sp, A) = 1$. On the other hand 2 $\to$ 1 remains valid without the mentioned hypothesis (our proof only uses that $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ and the general case follows by just extending Lemma 2.6 to the complex case). In any case we conjecture that condition $I(A) = I(sp, A)$ actually implies that all $A_{ij} \geq 0$, as in the 2×2 case.

3. $I(sp, A)$ and $I(2, A)$.

In this section we shall study the relation between the Hadamard indexes associated to the spectral and the Frobenius norms.

In Lemma 2.1 of [20] it is shown that the index $I(sp, \cdot)$ is always attained at rank one projections. It is natural to conjecture that the same result holds for any unitary invariant norm N. In the following Proposition we show that our conjecture is true for the Frobenius norm:

Proposition 3.1. *Let $A \in P(n)$. Then there exists $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $\|x\| = 1$ such that $I(2, A) = \|A \circ xx^*\|_2$. That is, $I(2, A)$ is attained at rank one projections.* *Proof.* Let $\lambda = \max\{\mu \geq 0 : \|A \circ B\|_2 \geq \mu \|B\|_2 \ \forall B \in P(n)$ of rank one $\}$. By its definition $\lambda \geq I(2, A)$. Let us prove that $\|A \circ B\|_2 \geq \lambda \|B\|_2$ for all $B \in P(n)$. Indeed, for $B \geq 0$, write $B = \sum_{i=1}^{k} B_i$ where each B_i has rank one, $B_i \in P(n)$ and $B_i B_j = 0$ if $i \neq j$. So

$$\lambda^2 \|B\|_2^2 = \lambda^2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} \|B_i\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \|A \circ B_i\|_2^2.$$

The proof is completed by showing that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \|A \circ B_i\|_2^2 \leq \|A \circ B\|_2^2.$$

Indeed, by the parallelogram law (actually its generalization to k vectors in the Euclidean space $(M_n, \|\cdot\|_2)$),

$$\sum_{\sigma} \| \sum_{i=1}^{k} (-1)^{\sigma_i} \ A \circ B_i \|_2^2 = 2^k \sum_{i=1}^{k} \|A \circ B_i\|_2^2, \tag{3}$$

where the sum runs over all $\sigma \in \{0, 1\}^k$. But clearly

$$-A \circ B \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} (-1)^{\sigma_i} \ A \circ B_i \leq A \circ B \ , \qquad \text{so}$$

$$|\langle \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{k} (-1)^{\sigma_i} \ A \circ B_i \Big) \ x, x \rangle| \ \leq \ \langle (A \circ B) x, x \rangle \ , \quad x \in \mathbb{C}^n$$

for all such σ. Therefore $\| \sum_{1}^{k} (-1)^{\sigma_i} \ A \circ B_i \|_2^2 \leq \|A \circ B\|_2^2$ for all σ. Then looking at the convex combination which follows from equation (3), we conclude that $\sum_{1}^{k} \|A \circ B_i\|_2^2 \leq \|A \circ B\|_2^2$ and the proof is complete ∎

Proposition 3.2. *Let $A \in P(n)$. Then*

1. *There exists a vector x with nonnegative entries such that $\|x\| = 1$ and $\|A \circ xx^*\|_2 = I(2, A)$.*
2. *x is an eigenvector of the matrix $A \circ \bar{A} \circ xx^*$ with eigenvalue $I(B_J)$, where $B = A \circ \bar{A}$ and $J = \{i : x_i \neq 0\}$.*

Proof. Let y be an unit vector such that $\|A \circ yy^*\|_2 = I(2, A)$. Let $y_i = \bar{w}_i |y_i|$, $|w_i| = 1$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. If $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_n)^t$ and D_w is the diagonal and unitary matrix with the vector w in its diagonal, then for each $C \in M_n$,

$$ww^* \circ C = (w_i \bar{w}_j \ C_{ij}) = D_w \ C \ D_w^*. \tag{4}$$

Therefore the Hadamard product by ww^* doesn't change 2-norms. Denote by $x = (|y_1|, \dots, |y_n|)^*$. Then

$$I(2,A) = \|A \circ yy^*\|_2 = \|A \circ yy^* \circ ww^*\|_2 = \|A \circ xx^*\|_2$$

showing item 1. Let $B = A \circ \bar{A} \in P(n)$. Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ with $\|y\| = 1$ and let $z = (y_1^2, \dots, y_n^2)^*$. Then

$$\|A \circ yy^*\|_2^2 = \sum_{i,j} |a_{ij}|^2 y_i^2 y_j^2 = \sum_{i,j} b_{ij} z_j z_i = \ \langle Bz, z\rangle$$

and $\sum_1^n z_i = 1$. Then $\|A \circ yy^*\|_2 = I(2,A)$ if and only if $\langle Bz, z\rangle$ is the minimum of the map $G(v) = \ \langle Bv, v\rangle$ in the simplex $\Delta = \{v \in (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n : \ \sum_1^n v_i = 1 \ \}$. Using Lemma 2.6, we know that if z belongs to the interior Δ° of Δ, then z is a local extreme of G in the plane $M = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_i z_i = 1 \ \}$, so $Bz = I(B)\ p$.
If the vector x of item 1 verifies that $x_i > 0$ for all i, then $z = x \circ x \in \Delta^\circ$ and $Bz = I(B)\ p$. Then item 2 follows from Lemma 2.7 with eigenvalue $I(B)$. If some $x_i = 0$, let $J = \{i : x_i \neq 0\}$, B_J the principal submatrix of B determined by the indexes of J and similarly define x_J. Then $I(2,A) = \|A \circ xx^*\|_2 = \|A_J \circ x_J x_J^*\|_2 \geq I(2, A_J)$ and

$$I(2,A) = I(2,A_J) = \|A_J \circ x_J x_J^*\|_2,$$

since the other inequality always hold by Remark 2.1. Note that, for it construction, x_J has no zero entries (in J). By the previous case, x_J is an eigenvector of $B_J \circ x_J x_J^*$ with eigenvalue $I(B_J)$. But clearly $B \circ xx^*$ has zeroes outside $J \times J$, so x is an eigenvector of $B \circ xx^*$ iff x_J is an eigenvector of $B_J \circ x_J x_J^*$. Note that the eigenvalue of x is always $I(B_J)$ ∎

THEOREM 3.3. *Let $A \in P(n)$. Then*

$$I(2,A) = I(sp, \bar{A} \circ A)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Denote by $B = \bar{A} \circ A$. Given $y \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $\|y\| = 1$, we have that

$$\|A \circ yy^*\|_2^2 = \sum_{i,j} |a_{ij}|^2 |y_i|^2 |y_j|^2 = \ \langle (B \circ yy^*)y, y\rangle \ \leq \|B \circ yy^*\|.$$

Therefore $I(2,A)^2 \leq I(sp, B)$. On the other hand, let x be a unit vector with non-negative entries such that $I(2,A)^2 = \|A \circ xx^*\|^2$ and $J = \{i : x_i \neq 0\}$. Then, by Proposition 3.2, $(B \circ xx^*)x = I(B_J)x$ and

$$I(2,A)^2 = \|A \circ xx^*\|^2 = \ \langle (B \circ xx^*)x, x\rangle \ = I(B_J).$$

But x_J is a unit eigenvector of $B_J \circ x_J x_J^*$ with strictly positive entries. So, by Lemma 2.7, $B_J(x_J \circ x_J) = I(B_J)(1, \dots, 1)^*$. Suppose that $I(2,A) \neq 0$. Then $I(B_J) \neq 0$ and, by Theorem 2.8 and Remark 2.1,

$$I(B_J) = I(sp, B_J) \geq I(sp, B) \geq I(2,A)^2 = I(B_J).$$

If $I(2,A)=0$, then by Remark 5.1 some $A_{ii}=0$. So also $I(sp,B)=0$ by the same Remark ∎

Corollary 3.4. *Let $A\in P(n)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} I(2,A) &= \inf \{ \ (\textstyle\sum_1^n D_{ii}^{-2})^{-1/2} : \ 0<D \quad \text{is diagonal and} \ \ A\circ\bar{A}\le D^2 \ \} \\ &= \inf \{ \ I(2,D) \ : \ 0<D \quad \text{is diagonal and} \ \ A\circ\bar{A}\le D^2 \ \}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. It is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.3 and Proposition 3.2 of [20]. See also Corollary 5.5 and Remark 5.6 below ∎

Remark 3.5. Theorem 3.3 was formulated in order to get information about a matrix $A\in P(n)$ using the matrix $B=\bar{A}\circ A\in P(n)$. But it can also be interpreted in the converse way, i.e. to get information about a matrix $B\in P(n)$ with nonnegative entries using the matrix $A=(B_{ij}^{1/2})$. Unfortunately it may certainly happen that $A\notin P(n)$ and one should check that $A\in P(n)$ in order to use the Theorem in this way. Nevertheless this restriction can be removed in the following way: Given a selfadjoint (but not necessarily positive) matrix $A\in M_n$, let us still consider the index

$$I(2,A)=\min\{ \ \|A\circ xx^*\|_2 \ : \ \|x\|=1 \ \}$$

defined by just acting on rank one projections. This definition is consistent for positive matrices by Proposition 3.1.

A careful observation of the proofs of Proposition 3.2 and Theorem 3.3 shows that they remain true using this new index if we replace the condition "$A\in P(n)$" by "$A=A^*$ and $B=\bar{A}\circ A\in P(n)$". Note that Lemma 2.6, Lemma 2.7 and Theorem 2.8 are only applied to the positive matrix B or its principal submatrices. The inequality $I(2,A)\le I(2,A_J)$ of Remark 2.1 (which is also used in the proofs) remains valid for this new index. This observation is useful in order to avoid the unpleasant condition $A=(B_{ij}^{1/2})\in P(n)$ in the following result.

Corollary 3.6. *Let $B\in P(n)$ such that $b_{ij}\ge 0$ for all i,j. Then there exists a subset J_0 of $\{1,2,\dots,n\}$ such that $I(sp,B)=I(sp,B_{J_0})=I(B_{J_0})$. Therefore*

$$I(sp,B)=\min\{ \ I(sp,B_J) \ : \ I(sp,B_J)=I(B_J) \ \}.$$

If $A=(b_{ij}^{1/2})$ (which may be not positive), then J_0 can be also characterized as $J_0=\{i: x_i\neq 0\}$ for some unit vector x such that $I(2,A)=\|A\circ xx^*\|_2$. Also $I(sp,B)=\|B\circ xx^*\|= \ \langle By,y\rangle$, where $y=(|x_1|^2,\dots,|x_n|^2)^*$.
Proof. Use Remark 3.5 and the proof of Theorem 3.3 ∎

4. An Operator Inequality. In this section we compute the indexes of a particulr type of matrices and, as an appplication, we get a new operator inequality, closely related to the inequality proved in [7], (see also [4], [16]).

Let $x=(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n)^*\in\mathbb{R}_+^n$, $S=\{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n\}$ and

$$\Lambda=\Lambda_x=\Big(\lambda_i\lambda_j+\frac{1}{\lambda_i\lambda_j}\ \Big)_{ij}\in P(n).$$

4.1. **Computation of $I(\Lambda)$**

1. If all λ_i are equal, then $\Lambda = (\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_1^{-2})\ P$ and $I(\Lambda) = \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_1^{-2}$.
2. If $\#S > 1$, then the image of Λ is generated by the vectors $x = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^*$ and $y = (\lambda_1^{-1}, \dots, \lambda_n^{-1})^*$, since $\Lambda = xx^* + yy^*$ and the matrix

$$\Lambda_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^2 + \lambda^{-2} & \lambda\mu + \lambda^{-1}\mu^{-1} \\ \lambda\mu + \lambda^{-1}\mu^{-1} & \mu^2 + \mu^{-2} \end{pmatrix}$$

is invertible if $\lambda \neq \mu$, so rk $\Lambda = 2$.
3. If $\#S = 2$, say $S = \{\lambda, \mu\}$, then $p = ax + by$, with $a = (\lambda + \mu)^{-1}$ and $b = \lambda\mu(\lambda + \mu)^{-1}$. If a vector z verifies that $\Lambda z = p$, then

$$p = \Lambda z = (xx^* + yy^*)z = \langle z, x\rangle x + \langle z, y\rangle y.$$

Therefore

$$I(\Lambda) = \langle z, p\rangle^{-1} = (\langle z, x\rangle^2 + \langle z, y\rangle^2)^{-1} = \frac{(\lambda + \mu)^2}{1 + \lambda^2\mu^2} = I(\Lambda_0),$$

where the last equality is shown in Remark 4.3 of [20].
4. If $\#S > 2$, it is easy to see that p can not live in the subspace generated by x and y. Then $I(\Lambda)$ must be zero by Proposition 2.2.

Note that $I(\Lambda) \neq 0$ if and only $\#S \leq 2$.

4.2. **Computation of $I(sp, \Lambda)$**

We shall compute $I(sp, \Lambda)$ using Corollary 3.6 and therefore use the principal minors of Λ, which are matrices of the same type. Let $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, $S_J = \{\lambda_j : j \in J\}$ and x_J is the induced vector. Then $\Lambda_J = \Lambda_{x_J}$ and so $I(sp, \Lambda_J) \neq 0$. Suppose that $I(sp, \Lambda_J) = I(\Lambda_J)$. Then $\#S_J \leq 2$ by 4.1. If $\#S_J = 2$, let $i_1, i_2 \in J$ such that $\lambda_{i_1} \neq \lambda_{i_2}$. By Theorem 2.8 there exists a vector $0 \leq y \in \mathbb{R}^J$ such that $\Lambda_J\ y = p_J$. Let $z_1 = \sum\{y_k : k \in J \text{ and } \lambda_k = \lambda_{i_1}\} \geq 0$ and $z_2 = \sum\{y_j : j \in J \text{ and } \lambda_j = \lambda_{i_2}\} \geq 0$. Easy computations show that $\Lambda_{\{i_1,i_2\}}(z_1, z_2)^* = (1, 1)^*$. Then, by Theorem 2.8 and 4.1,

$$I(sp, \Lambda_J) = I(\Lambda_J) = \frac{(\lambda_{i_1} + \lambda_{i_2})^2}{1 + \lambda_{i_1}^2\lambda_{i_2}^2} = I(\Lambda_{\{i_1,i_2\}}) = I(sp, \Lambda_{\{i_1,i_2\}}).$$

Therefore, in order to compute $I(sp, \Lambda)$ using Corollary 3.6, we only have to consider the diagonal entries of Λ and some of the principal minors of size 2×2. If $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$, by equation (2),

$$I(sp, \Lambda_{\{i,j\}}) = I(\Lambda_{\{i,j\}}) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \lambda_i\lambda_j + \frac{1}{\lambda_i\lambda_j} \leq \min\{\lambda_i^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda_i^2}\ ,\ \lambda_j^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda_j^2}\}.$$

Easy computations show that, if $\lambda_i < \lambda_j$, this condition is equivalent to

$$\lambda_i^2 \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_i\lambda_j} \leq \lambda_j^2. \tag{5}$$

In particular, this implies that $\lambda_i < 1 < \lambda_j$. So, by Corollary 3.6,

$$I(sp, \Lambda) = \min\{M_1, M_2\} \tag{6}$$

where $M_1 = \min_i \lambda_i^2 + \lambda_i^{-2} = \min_i \Lambda_{ii}$ and

$$M_2 = \inf\Big\{\frac{(\lambda_i + \lambda_j)^2}{1 + \lambda_i^2\lambda_j^2} \ : \ \lambda_i < 1 < \lambda_j \ \text{ and } \ \lambda_i^2 \le \frac{1}{\lambda_i\lambda_j} \le \lambda_j^2\Big\}.$$

For example, if all $\lambda_i \ge 1$ (or all $\lambda_i \le 1$), then by equation (5) $I(sp, \Lambda) = M_1 = \min_i \lambda_i^2 + \lambda_i^{-2}$. On the other hand, if $\lambda \ne 1$ and $x = (\lambda, \lambda^{-1})^*$, then

$$I(sp, \Lambda_x) = M_2 = \frac{\lambda^2 + \lambda^{-2}}{2} + 1 < M_1 = \lambda^2 + \lambda^{-2}.$$

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space and S a bounded selfadjoint invertible operator on $\mathcal{H}$. Let $M(S)$ be the best constant such that*

$$\|STS + S^{-1}TS^{-1}\| \ge M(S)\|T\| \quad \textit{for all} \ \ 0 \le T \in L(\mathcal{H})$$

Then $M(S) = \min\{M_1(S), M_2(S)\}$, where

$$M_1(S) = \min_{\lambda \in \ \sigma(S)} \lambda^2 + \lambda^{-2} \qquad \textit{and}$$

$$M_2(S) = \inf\Big\{\frac{(|\lambda| + |\mu|)^2}{1 + \lambda^2\mu^2} : \lambda, \mu \in \sigma(S), |\lambda| < |\mu| \ \textit{and} \ \lambda^2 \le \frac{1}{|\lambda\mu|} \le \mu^2\Big\},$$

In particular, if $\|S\| \le 1$ (or $\|S^{-1}\| \le 1$), then

$$M(S) = \|S\|^2 + \|S\|^{-2} \quad (\textit{resp.} \ \ \|S^{-1}\|^2 + \|S^{-1}\|^{-2}).$$

Proof. We shall use the same steps as in [7]. By taking the polar decomposition of S, we can suppose that $S > 0$, since the unitary part of S is also the unitary part of S^{-1}, commutes with S and S^{-1} and doesn't change norms. Note that we have to change $\sigma(S)$ by $\sigma(|S|) = \{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \sigma(S)\}$.

By the spectral theorem, we can suppose that $\sigma(S)$ is finite, since S can be approximated in norm by operators S_n such that each $\sigma(S_n)$ is a finite subset of $\sigma(S)$, $\sigma(S_n) \subset \sigma(S_{n+1})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\cup_n \sigma(S_n)$ is dense in $\sigma(S)$. So $M(S_n)$ (and $M_i(S_n), \ i = 1, 2$) converges to $M(S)$ (resp. $M_i(S), \ i = 1, 2$).

We can suppose also that $\dim \mathcal{H} < \infty$, by choosing an appropiate net of finite rank projections $\{P_F\}_{F \in \mathcal{F}}$ which converges strongly to the identity and replacing S, T by P_FSP_F, P_FTP_F. Indeed, the net may be choosen in such a way that $SP_F = P_FS$ and $\sigma(P_FSP_F) = \sigma(S)$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Note that for every $A \in L(H)$, $\|P_FAP_F\|$ converges to $\|A\|$.

Finally, we can suppose that S is diagonal by a unitary change of basis in $\mathbb{C}^n$. In this case, if $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ are the eigenvalues of S (with multiplicity) and $x = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^*$, then

$$STS + S^{-1}TS^{-1} = \Lambda_x \circ T.$$

Note that all our reductions (unitary equivalences and compressions) doesn't change the fact that $0 \le T$. Now the statement follows from formula (6). If $\|S\| \le 1$ then $M(S) = M_1(S)$, since $M_2(S)$ is the infimum of the empty set. Clearly $M_1(S)$ is attained at the element $\lambda \in \sigma(S)$ such that $|\lambda| = \|S\|$ ∎

5. General unitary invariant norms. Let N be an unitary invariant norm in M_n and let Φ be the symmetric gauge function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ associated with N (see, for example, Chapter IV of [5]). Our formulae are closely related to the mean

$$M_\Phi : (\mathbb{R}^+)^n \to \mathbb{R}^+, \quad \text{given by} \quad M_\Phi(d_1, \dots, d_n) = \Phi'(d_1^{-1}, \dots, d_n^{-1})^{-1},$$

where Φ' is the dual norm of Φ. Of particular interest are those means induced by the Schatten p-norms, i.e $M_p : (\mathbb{R}^+)^n \to \mathbb{R}^+$, $1 < p \le \infty$ given by

$$M_p(d_1, \dots, d_n) = (\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{-q})^{-1/q} = \|(d_1^{-1}, \dots, d_n^{-1})\|_q^{-1}, \quad (d_1, \dots, d_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^n,$$

where q is the conjugate number of p. Coherently, we define M_1 by

$$M_1(d_1, \dots, d_n) = \min_{1 \le i \le n} d_i.$$

Note that $\frac{1}{n} M_\infty$ is usually known as the *harmonic mean.*

In the following Remark we state several elementary properties of the index $I(N, \cdot\,)$ which hold for every unitary invariant norm:

Remark 5.1. Let $A \in P(n)$ and N an unitarily invariant norm. Then

1. If we replace N by $m\ N$ for some $m > 0$, then the associated Hadamard index does not change. Therefore, from now on we shall assume that the norms are normalized, i.e. $N(E_{11}) = 1$.
2. $I(N, A) \le \min_{1 \le i \le n} A_{ii}$, which can be seen just using the matrices E_{ii}.
3. Note that $\| \cdot \|_{sp} \le N(\cdot) \le \| \cdot \|_1 \le n \| \cdot \|_{sp}$. Then, if A has no zero diagonal entries,

   $$(\sum_1^n A_{ii}^{-1})^{-1} \le n\ I(N, A),$$

   since $(\sum_1^n A_{ii}^{-1})^{-1} \le I(sp, A)$, by Corollary 3.7 of [20].
4. A consequence of the last inequalities is that

   $$I(N, A) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \text{some } A_{ii} = 0.$$

5. If $A \leq B$, then $I(N, A) \leq I(N, B)$, since the same inequalities hold for the singular values of A and B.
6. If $J \subseteq \{1,\ 2, \ldots,\ n\}$ and A_J is the principal submatrix of A associated to J. Then $I(N, A) \leq I(N, A_J)$. Indeed, the minimum which defines $I(N, A_J)$ is taken over less matrices than the minimum which defines $I(N, A)$.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $A \in P(n)$ a rank one matrix. Then, for every unitary invariant norm N,*

$$I(N, A) = M_1(A_{11}, \ldots, A_{nn}) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} A_{ii},$$

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $A = xx^*$. Let

$$m = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i|^2 = (\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} A_{ii}).$$

We need to show that for every $B \in P(n)$,

$$N(xx^* \circ B) \geq m\ N(B), \tag{7}$$

since this would imply that $I(N, A) \geq m$ and the other inequality always holds by 1. of Remark 5.1. Clearly we can suppose that $m \neq 0$, so $x_i \neq 0$ $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let $y = (x_1^{-1}, \ldots, x_n^{-1})^t$. Then $B = yy^* \circ (xx^* \circ B)$. Using a basic inequlity for the singular values (namely $s_i(\cdot)$) of a Hadamard product (Theorem 1 of [2]), we get that for $1 \leq k \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \textstyle\sum_1^k s_i(B) \quad &= \textstyle\sum_1^k s_i(yy^* \circ (xx^* \circ B)) \\ &\leq \textstyle\sum_1^k |\tilde{y}_i|^2 s_i(xx^* \circ B) \\ &\leq m^{-1} \textstyle\sum_1^k s_i(xx^* \circ B), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{y}$ is the vector y rearranged in such a way that $|\tilde{y}_1| \geq |\tilde{y}_2| \geq \ldots \geq |\tilde{y}_n|$ (which are the "Euclidean norms" of the "columns" of the $1 \times n$ matrix y^*). But this implies that equation (7) is true for the Ky-Fan norms $\|\cdot\|_{(k)}$ and therefore for every unitary invariant norm (see Theorem IV.2.2 of [5]) ∎

Proposition 5.3. *For every unitary invariant norm N and every diagonal matrix $D > 0$,*

$$I(N, D) = N'(D^{-1})^{-1},$$

where N' is the dual norm of N.
Proof. Denote by $d_i = D_{ii}$, $d = (d_1, \ldots, d_n)^*$ and $d^{-1} = (d_1^{-1}, \ldots, d_n^{-1})^*$. Let Φ be the symmetric gauge function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ associated with N. Let Φ' be the dual norm of Φ on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then Φ' corresponds to the dual norm N' in M_n (see IV.2.11 of [5]) and,

for any $A \in P(n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} N(A) \le \|A\|_1 \quad &= \textstyle\sum_1^n A_{ii} = \sum_1^n d_i^{-1} d_i A_{ii} \\ &\le \Phi'(d^{-1})\Phi(d_i A_{ii}) \\ &= N'(D^{-1}) N(D \circ A). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $I(N,D) \ge N'(D^{-1})^{-1}$. On the other hand, let $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\Phi(y) = 1$ and $\langle d^{-1}, y\rangle \ = \Phi'(d^{-1})$. Since Φ is a symmetric gauge function, we can suppose that all $y_i \ge 0$. Let $x = (d_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \dots, d_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y_n)^{\frac{1}{2}})^*$. Then

$$N(xx^*) = \|xx^*\|_1 = \text{tr } (xx^*) = \ \langle d^{-1}, y\rangle \ = \Phi'(d^{-1})$$

and

$$N(D \circ xx^*) = \Phi(y) = 1.$$

Therefore

$$I(N,D) \le \frac{N(D \circ xx^*)}{N(xx^*)} = \Phi'(d^{-1})^{-1} = N'(D^{-1})^{-1} \quad ∎$$

Remark 5.4. Given $A \in P(n)$ and an unitary invariant norm N, the lower bound for $I(N,A)$ given in 2. of Remark 5.1 can be improved in the following manner: denote $D(A) = A \circ I$ and suppose that $D(A)$ is invertible. Then

$$I(N,A) \ge I(N, D(A)) = N'(D(A)^{-1})^{-1} = \Phi'(A_{11}^{-1}, \dots, A_{nn}^{-1})^{-1} > 0,$$

with N' and Φ' as in the proof of Proposition 5.3. Indeed, it is well known that for every matrix C, $N(I \circ C) \le N(C)$ (for example, because $I \circ C$ is a convex combination of matrices unitarily equivalent to C). Therefore for every $B \in P(n)$,

$$N(A \circ B) \ge N(I \circ A \circ B) = N(D(A) \circ B) \ge I(N, D(A)) \ N(B)$$

Corollary 5.5. *Let $0 < D$ be a diagonal matrix. Then, for $1 < p \le \infty$ and $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$, we have that*

$$I(p, D) = M_p(D_{11}, \dots, D_{nn}) = (\sum_1^n D_{ii}^{-q})^{-1/q}.$$

Remark 5.6. In the case of the spectral norm, the index of the diagonal matrices determine the index of all positive matrices. Indeed, it is shown in Proposition 3.2 of [20] that

$$I(sp, A) \quad = \inf \ \{ \ I(sp, D) : A \le D \ \text{ and } D \text{ is diagonal} \ \} \tag{8}$$

since the condition $\begin{pmatrix} D & A \\ A & D \end{pmatrix} \geq 0$ which appears in that Proposition is clearly equivalent to $A \leq D$. One could be tempted to conjecture that similar formulae hold for other norms. Unfortunately this assertion fails, at least in this simple formulation. For example, Corollary 3.4 says that, using the Frobenius norm $\| \cdot \|_2$, for every $A \in P(n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} I(2,A) &= \inf\{ (\textstyle\sum_1^n D_{ii}^{-2})^{-1/2} : D \text{ is diagonal and } A \circ \bar{A} \leq D^2 \} \\ &= \inf \; \{ \; I(2,D) \; : \; D \quad \text{is diagonal and } \; A \circ \bar{A} \leq D^2 \; \}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Note that the condition $A \circ \bar{A} \leq D^2$ is strictly less restrictive that $A \leq D$ (the reverse implication follows from Schur Theorem). It can be easily seen with a computer that formula (8) does not hold for the Frobenius norm. Nevertheless, equation (9) allows one to compute the 2-index for every positive matrix using only diagonal matrices.

REFERENCES

[1] T. Ando, Majorizations and inequalities in matrix theory, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 199: 17-67, 1994.

[2] T. Ando, R. H. Horn and R. C. Johnson, The singular values of a Hadamard product: a basic inequality, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra* 21: 345-365, 1987.

[3] T. Ando and K. Okubo, Induced norms of the Schur multiplier operator, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 147: 181-199, 1991.

[4] E. Andruchow, G. Corach and D. Stojanoff, Geometric operator inequalities, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 258: 295-310, 1997.

[5] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.

[6] M. Baillet, Y. Denizeau and J. F. Havet, Indice d'une esperance conditionelle, *Compositio Math.* 66: 199-236, 1988.

[7] G. Corach, H. Porta and L. Recht, An operator inequality, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 142: 153-158, 1990.

[8] C. C. Cowen, K. E. Debro and P. D. Sepansky, Geometry and the norms of Hadamard multipliers, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 218: 239-249, 1995.

[9] C. C. Cowen, M. A. Dritschtel and R. C. Penney, Norms of Hadamard multipliers, *SIAM J. Matrix. Anal. Appl.* 15: 313-320, 1994.

[10] C. Davis, The norm of the Schur product operation, *Numer. Math.* 4: 343-344, 1962.

[11] Y. Denizeau and J. F. Havet, Correpondances d'indice fini I: indice d'un vecteur, *J. Operator Theory*, 32: 111-156, 1994.

[12] U. Haagerup, Decompositions of completely bounded maps on operator algebras, unpublished manuscript.

[13] R. H. Horn, R. C. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990.

[14] R. H. Horn, Norm bounds for Hadamard products and an arithmetic -geometric mean inequality for unitarily invariant norms, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 223/224: 119-129, 1995.

[15] M. Fiedler and T. L. Markham, Some inequalities for the Hadamard product of matrices, *Linear Alg. Appl.* 246: 13-16, 1996.

[16] L. Livshits and S. C. Ong, On the invertibility properties of the map $T \mapsto STS^{-1} + S^{-1}TS$ and operator-norm inequalities, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 183: 117-129, 1993.

[17] R. Mathias, Matrix completions, norms and Hadamard products, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 117: 905-918, 1993.

[18] V. I. Paulsen, S. C. Power and R. R. Smith, Schur products and matrix completions, *J. Functional Analysis*, 85: 151-178, 1989.

[19] I. Schur, Bemerkungen zur theorie de beschränkten bilineareformen mit unendlich vielen veränderlichen, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 140: 1-28, 1911.

[20] D. Stojanoff, Index of Hadamard multiplication by positive matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 290: 95-108, 1999.